1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 7 JESS RICHARD SMITH, NO: 4:17-CV-5082-RMP 8 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING RULE 60(b) 9 MOTION, AFFIRMING ORDER TO v. AMEND OR VOLUNTARILY 10 DISMISS, ADOPTING REPORT TONY GONZALEZ, S. BUTTICE, S. SUNDBERG, ROY GONZALEZ, AND RECOMMENDATION, 11 LISA MORROW, R. HERZOG, J. DENYING MOTION FOR AIYEKU, and WASHINGTON TEMPORARY RESTRAINING DEPARTMENT OF 12 ORDER, AND RE-NOTING CORRECTIONS, **DEADLINE** 13 Defendant. 14 BEFORE THE COURT is Magistrate Judge Dimke's Report and 15 16 Recommendation to deny Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order. 17 ECF No. 14. Plaintiff, Jess Richard Smith, a prisoner at the Washington State 18 Penitentiary, is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis; Defendants have not 19 been served. 20 ORDER DENYING RULE 60(b) MOTION, AFFIRMING ORDER TO AMEND 21 OR VOLUNTARILY DISMISS, ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, AND RE-NOTING DEADLINE -- 1

Mr. Smith did not file objections to the Report and Recommendation and his deadline for doing so was August 29, 2017. Rather, Mr. Smith filed a document titled, "Motion for Relief from Order CR 60," ECF No. 16, in which he challenges the Order directing him to amend or voluntarily dismiss, ECF NO. 13. Mr. Smith's Motion was noted for hearing on September 22, 2017, but considered without oral argument on the date signed below.

Mr. Smith seeks relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60 from the Court's screening Order, claiming the Magistrate Judge is "acting as an opposing party by raising Rule 12 defenses for the defendants." ECF No. 16 at 2. Mr. Smith's argument lacks merit. A federal court is statutorily obligated to screen complaints brought by prisoners. 28 U.S.C. §1915A(a). Although Mr. Smith was advised of the deficiencies of his complaint, he has not amended or dismissed it.

Rule 60(b) provides that "[o]n motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a party . . . from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); . . . or (6) any other reason that justifies relief." Relief under Rule 60 "is to be used sparingly as an equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice and is to be utilized only where extraordinary circumstances exist." *Harvest v. Castro*, 531 F.3d 737, 749 (9th Cir.

ORDER DENYING RULE 60(b) MOTION, AFFIRMING ORDER TO AMEND OR VOLUNTARILY DISMISS, ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, AND RE-NOTING DEADLINE -- 2

2008) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). No final judgment or order has been entered in this action. Therefore, Rule 60(b) is not applicable.

To the extent Mr. Smith is challenging Magistrate Judge Dimke's Order to Amend or Voluntarily Dismiss under 28 U.S.C. § 636(A), he has failed to show that this Order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Therefore, **IT IS**ORDERED Plaintiff's Motion, ECF No. 16, will be **DENIED** and the Order to Amend or Voluntarily Dismiss, ECF No. 13, will be **AFFIRMED**.

On August 15, 2017, Magistrate Judge Dimke recommended denying Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 5, as Mr. Smith had not yet presented a legally sufficient complaint and the Court was without jurisdiction to grant the Motion. There being no objections, **IT IS ORDERED** the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 14, will be **ADOPTED** in its entirety and the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 5, will be **DENIED**.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Order CR 60, ECF No. 16, is
   DENIED.
- 2. The Order to Amend or Voluntarily Dismiss, ECF No. 13, is **AFFIRMED.**

ORDER DENYING RULE 60(b) MOTION, AFFIRMING ORDER TO AMEND OR VOLUNTARILY DISMISS, ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, AND RE-NOTING DEADLINE -- 3

1	3. Magistrate Judge Dimke's Report and Recommendation to Deny Motio		
2	for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 14, is <b>ADOPTED in its</b>		
3	entirety.		
4	4. Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 5, is		
5	DENIED.		
6	5. The Clerk of Court shall <b>RE-NOTE</b> the deadline to Amend or		
7	Voluntarily Dismiss to <b>thirty</b> (30) days after the date of this Order.		
8	The District Court Clerk is directed to enter this Order and provide a copy to		
9	Plaintiff, along with a form Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss Complaint <b>and a civil</b>		
10	rights complaint form.		
11	DATED October 12, 2017.		
12	a/December Malant Determen		
13	s/Rosanna Malouf Peterson  ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON		
14	United States District Judge		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21	ORDER DENYING RULE 60(b) MOTION, AFFIRMING ORDER TO AMEND OR VOLUNTARILY DISMISS, ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY		

RESTRAINING ORDER, AND RE-NOTING DEADLINE -- 4

1			
2			
3			
4			
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
6			
7	JESS RICHARD SMITH,	NO: 4:17-CV-5082-RMP	
8	Plaintiff,	MOTION TO VOLUNTARILY	
9	v.	DISMISS COMPLAINT	
10	TONY GONZALEZ, S. BUTTICE, S. SUNDBERG, ROY GONZALEZ,		
11	LISA MORROW, R. HERZOG, J. AIYEKU, and WASHINGTON		
12	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,		
13	Defendants.		
14	Plaintiff IESS PICHARD SMITH requests the Court grant his Motion to		
	Plaintiff JESS RICHARD SMITH requests the Court grant his Motion to		
15	Voluntarily Dismiss the Complaint pursuant to Rule 41(a), Federal Rules of Civil		
16	Procedure. Plaintiff is proceeding <i>pro se</i> ; Defendants have not been served in this		
17	action.		
18	<b>DATED</b> thisday of	2017.	
19			
20	JESS RICHARD SMITH		
21			
	MOTION TO VOLUNTARILY DISMISS COMPLAINT 1		